

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed April 13, 2010, Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10-12 and 18-24 remain in this application. Claims 1, 3, 7-8 and 18-19 and 23-24 have been amended. Claim 9 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. In view of the remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating that Claims 9-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, claims 3, 5-9 and 23 are objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the claims in a manner which is believed to overcome the stated objections. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Rejection of Claim 1, 4, 8, 18, 19, 21-22 and 24

The Office has rejected Claims 1, 4, 8, 18, 19, 21-22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0036716 (“Ito”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,518,962 (“Kimura”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,462,735 (“Naito”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 18, 19, 21-22 and 24 are allowable

Independent Claim 1 has been amended herein to better define Applicant’s invention over the combination of Kimura and Onagawa. Particularly, in the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 9 is herewith cancelled,

without prejudice, and claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of now-cancelled claim 9. It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as herewith amended, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references as admitted by the Office. Hence, claim 1 is allowable. Claim 8 is also allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

Independent Claim 18 recites similar subject matter as Independent Claim 1 and therefore contains the limitations of Claim 1. Hence, for at least the same reasons given for Claims 1, Claim 18 is believed to recite statutory subject matter under 35 USC 103(a). Accordingly, claims 19, 21-22 and 24 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 18.

Rejection of Claim 3, 5-7, 20 and 23

The Office has rejected claims 3, 5-7, 20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kimura and US Patent Publication no. 2003/0025718 (“Mori”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 3, 5-7, 20 and 23 are allowable

As explained above, the cited portions of Kimura do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1 and 18 from which claims {3, 5-7} and {20, 23}, depend, respectively. Mori does not disclose each of the elements of claim 1 that are not disclosed by Kimura. For example, the cited portions of Mori fail to disclose or suggest, *“active matrix circuitry including first and second drive transistors for driving a current through the display element, wherein the first and second drive transistors are in parallel, each connected between a respective power supply line and the EL display element, the input to the pixel being provided to the gates of the first and second drive transistors, and wherein the first drive transistor is supplied with a first supply voltage and the second drive transistor is supplied with a second supply voltage, at least one of the supply voltages being variable in dependence on the combined brightness level”*, as recited in claims 1 and 18. Hence, claims 1 and 18 are allowable and claims {3, 5-7} and {20, 23}, are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claims 1 and 18, respectively.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10-12 and 18-24 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Mike Belk, Esq., Intellectual Property Counsel, Philips Electronics North America, at 914-945-6000.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Scaturro
Reg. No. 51,356
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, Previously Presented York 10510-8001